Caste Hindus and Harijans (clash in Doddaganjur, Chintamani Taluk).

Q.—532. Sri A. MUNIYAPPA (Sidlaghatta-Chikballapur — Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was a clash between caste Hindus and Harijans in Doddaganjur, Chintamani Taluk, on matters relating to religion;

(*b*) whether it has come to their notice that the taluk police officers are remaining indifferent without taking any steps though complaint was lodged with them;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the Commissioner for Depressed Classes went to the spot and enquired into the affair;

(*d*) whether they have taken any steps against those that have acted contrary to law in this connection?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) and (*b*) Both the parties have filed criminal cases. The matter is *sub judice*.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) *Vide* answer for (*a*) and (*b*).

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS TO COVER EXCESS EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR 1950-51.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall now go to the next item of the business in the Agenda.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I beg to move that the Excess Expenditure for the year 1950-51 may be taken up.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—It is the duty of the Finance Minister to move the adoption of the Excess Grants. I would like to know if the Finance Minister will be here. If you are going to permit the Education Minister to deputise for him, so far as the House is concerned, we would like to have the Finance Minister amidst us.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am sorry, I have to disappoint him in his attempt to express his love for the Finance Minister. I am acting for him and I request the Leader of the Opposition to extend the same affection to me.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In my case, love is not blind.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is discriminatory. It is not allowed by law. Sir, I am moving for the consideration of the Excess Expenditure for the year 1950-51. In this connection, I wish to refer to one or two factors. I invite the attention of this House to page 6 of the Appropriation Accounts, 1950-51 and the Audit Report for 1952. On page 6, the total amount voted for the year is shown as Rs. 24,17,75,500. There were Supplementary Appropriation Acts one of which was for Rs. 71,21,200 and another for Rs. 2,12,02,565. The total amount is Rs. 27,00,99,265. The aggregate disbursements amount to Rs. 22,19,25,431, leaving a minus balance of Rs. 4,81,73,834. Taking the total expenditure for the year, the Government have not spent anything in excess of the total amounts voted. That is one point which has to be kept in mind. The other point is that these are accounts for 1950-51. The amount has been spent and in the Budget of the subsequent years, while showing the actuals, these figures have been shown. The point of view is that these facts have already come to the notice of this Hon'ble House and they had their opportunity to make observations thereon. In this connection, the practice is that the discussion would be on the reasons for the excess expenditure, and in view of the discussions that have already taken place while submitting the budgets of the previous year, I submit, Sir, that the discussion might be limited and a time might be fixed. One other observation I wish to make is that the Demands have been noted in a list which has been distributed. I submit, Sir, that general discussion on all the items might take place and the amount asked for voted because they have already been spent and they had come also under the purview of this House. With these